NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION

INFORMATION LETTER

PUBLICATION OR REPRODUCTION NOT PERMITTED

No. 524 Washington, D. C. October 20, 1934

WHOLESALE GROCERS ASK OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT LABELING VIEWS TO PRESIDENT

The National-American Wholesale Grocers' Association has addressed a letter to the President, under date of October 15, regarding the report submitted on September 26 by the Labeling Committee of the canning industry, in which the association requests an opportunity to present to the President personally, through a small committee, the views of those in the wholesale food trade who are anxious to develop a system of informative labeling of canned foods and, through educational work among consumers, to make standards of quality and labeling useful as well as effective.

With reference to the A B C grades, it is stated that it is not the purpose of the letter to set forth the many genuine reasons why such a system in actual operation would result, first, in confusion to, rather than enlightenment of, consumers; second, a general lowering of the packing and distributing standards throughout the country; and, third, substantial injury to the growers of fruits and vegetables.

The letter assures the President that wholesale grocers who distribute canned foods under their own labels are anxious to aid in the formulation of some plan of informative labeling that would be enforceable and which would be of real benefit to the consumers of canned foods.

B. F. JULIAN NAMED MEMBER OF CODE AUTHORITY

The selection of B. F. Julian, of the Marshfield Supply Company, Marshfield, Mo., as a member of the Code Authority for the Canning Industry has been approved by the National Recovery Administration. He succeeds Porter S. Lucas, of Crane, Mo., who resigned some time ago.

WHAT'S BEHIND THE REPORT OF THE CONSUMERS' ADVISORY BOARD ON LABELING

Shortly after the Labeling Committee of the canning industry submitted to the National Recovery Administration its report embodying a plan for the descriptive labeling of canned foods, the N.R.A. issued to the press a statement from the Con-

sumers' Advisory Board criticizing the Committee's proposals and advocating the adoption of the Canadian grading and labeling system. The Labeling Committee which formulated the descriptive labeling plan has made the following statement regarding the comments of the Consumers' Advisory Board.

Proper evaluation of the worth of, and the consideration which should be accorded to, the recent statement of the Consumers' Advisory Board should take account of the previous insistent activities of the Board in connection with quality grading. The facts are that this Board embarrassed and delayed the completion of the Canners Code, and also endeavored in connection with every marketing agreement considered by the canning industry, to force acceptance of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics so-called A B C grades upon the canning industry. The industry was put to great expenditure of time and labor to combat these impractical proposals.

The point upon which the public should be particularly informed is that the A B C grades which the Board so enthusiastically and insistently attempted to force upon the industry have now been abandoned because of their impracticality and unenforcibility, and that the Board's sole reliance for quality grading is the plan of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to formulate new quality grades, in connection with which it is stated that a grading system for one product—tomatoes—has been worked out, but that the details have not been published. The new formula for determining quality grades has been explained orally to representatives of the canning industry, who agree that the new formula is less objectionable than the old one, but who nevertheless maintain that the new system is still unsound in principle and therefore unworkable.

To the practical and consistent mind it seems odd that, with the collapse of the former A B C grades upon which the Consumers' Advisory Board has insisted, they can now offer their judgment as superior to that of the informed men of the industry, and argue for adoption of a new bureaucratic system as yet only projected, and support this argument by vague and uncertain reference to the Canadian system.

The canning industry, which freely admits the deficiencies in its present labeling system, has long sought a means of improvement that would meet with official sanction. It is a fact that during a period of twenty years the industry has thought it desirable to work out a system conforming to the governmental idea of quality grades, but despite the best efforts of the industry and of the federal bureaus little progress has been made. With the concerted and persistent effort to force upon the industry grade definitions formulated upon a theory that has been so thoroughly demonstrated as impractical, a crisis was reached. The industry therefore sought a new and entirely practical approach to the problem. The result is the proposed plan for descriptive labeling. The industry will use every effort to put into general usuage the system of descriptive labeling that has been developed, and the Labeling Committee, having in mind the long-time welfare of both the industry and the growers of canners' crops for whom it serves as a marketing agent, will resist in very practical way the ruination of the industry's business and prospects by having forced upon it the unsound ideas of theorists who have nothing at stake except pride of opinion.

The industry has consistently and patiently endeavored to point out to the representatives of the Consumers' Advisory Board the impracticality of their proposals. It has had contact with only two or three representa-

tives of the Board, while seemingly the decisions and policies of that Board have been made by persons having no contact with the subject and seemingly no information. Accordingly the industry has reluctantly concluded that the underlying purpose is to force upon the industry the things that were projected in the Tugwell bill. When the Tugwell bill was before both branches of Congress, the time of the leaders of the canning industry was wasted and the recovery program impeded while these leaders were defending the industry against being forced to put in the Canners' Code, and in marketing agreements, what were really legislative proposals that were then before Congress. Though the industry's representatives asked what connection the grading question had with the recovery program or how it would expedite business recovery, in which time was the essence, no answer was ever forthcoming. However, the pressure was continued unremittingly. The time now seems at hand when the welfare of the industry requires relief from bureaucratic harassment.

It is obvious that the reason for bureaucratic insistence upon quality grades is that this is the keystone of the whole idealistic Tugwell bill scheme. A labeling plan that is without vagueness and without uncertainty would afford no basis for requiring federal inspectors permanently located in factories. The scheme for eliminating advertising as an economic waste would have no starting point unless there were compulsory federal inspection and certification of products.

The Board's report starts out by referring to the canners' proposed system of labeling as a half-way measure. This is a very unfair statement, because the canning industry proposes to tell the consumer in descriptive terms all the characteristics of its products that can be defined or measured by physical measurement or other objective test.

The Board's next comment is that numerous tests would have to be worked out for every canned product. This statement tends to prejudice rather than to inform, because it is obvious that tests will be necessary with any other enforcible system that can be evolved. Their next point is to emphasize the desirability of "one familiar statement." The answer to this is that no one statement can adequately portray the facts.

They are next concerned about the canners' problem in connection with the printing of his labels. It is freely admitted that the canners' proposal will place upon the industry a considerable additional burden in connection with label supplies, but this is logically an incidental matter, a detail which is to be regarded only as a detail rather than as an argument for departure from principle.

For several years canners have been in position, if they so desired, to use the A B C grade label system, and the Board attempts to explain the very limited extent to which it actually has been used by saying that "the graded products have had to stand competition from other products upon whose labels the canner might place any unsupported claim of excellence that suited his fancy." The public is entitled to a full understanding of the facts in this connection, which are these: For years the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has conducted an active propaganda for the adoption of its grading system, even circularizing the industry with an offer to inaugurate an official broadcasting program to induce consumers to buy A B C labeled products if canners packing a total of five million cases would agree to have their products inspected and graded under the Bureau's system. But despite this promise of advertising at public expense very few canners were induced to adopt the A B C grades, and the

efforts of the Bureau had to be turned toward other possible ways of getting its system adopted by or forced upon the industry.

The Board's report then devotes considerable attention to the Canadian grading system. It admits that Canadian packers themselves "comment that the specifications upon which the grades are based do not meet proper requirements." Further, they say, "On this point the Consumers' Board is not prepared to pass judgment." But this does not deter them from commending to the United States industry consideration of a system which Canadian canners do not feel is meeting the proper requirements, but which the Consumers' Board implies has merited "consumer confidence" and has "rewarded the canners with increased sales and a larger proportion of high quality sales." These claims for the Canadian system are weakened, if not discredited, by the next statement of the Board, which refers to "these experiences, if true." Obviously if the Board were sure of the facts there would be no need of the "if true" qualification.

Still further confession of the weakness of the Board's argument for adoption of the Canadian system is given in the Board's next statement that it "has evidence of a very recent date that at least some Canadian canners are wholly in favor of the grading act." Having in mind that "at least some" United States canners favor the A B C grades, it is not surprising that "at least some" of the Canadian canners would favor their compulsory system.

The essence of the problem is reached in the paragraph of the Board's report in which it states: "Our intent in urging the adoption of grade standards is to give the consumer protection and enable her to purchase canned foods judiciously by supplying her with some index whereby she can determine why she should pay a greater price for one can than another due to the fact that she is receiving a higher quality." The only inference that can be drawn from this is that she should pay identical prices for products bearing the same grade label regardless of the brand name or of statements, other than the grade designation, appearing on the label.

The Labeling Committee contends that were grades carried on the label, price competition would compel canners to "grade down" their products to the minimum of the respective grades, which is done in the grain trade, where low quality wheat is mixed with higher quality wheat to the greatest possible amount permitted by the grade specifications. Perhaps the public does not understand that grade definitions must always be on the basis of the lowest permitted quality for the given grade.

In contrast with these proposals for grade labeling like the A B C system, descriptive labeling is a definite, practical, and enforcible plan for putting on the label the information that consumers want and need to guide their buying. It would place on the label terms for characteristics of the product that are susceptible of physical or other objective test. This term would be one familiar to or used by the consumer. It would be so defined to the canner that he can use it properly, and likewise so defined that food authorities can enforce its proper use and penalize the canner for its misuse. It is a plan that can be further developed and refined as scientific research makes possible new or more accurate tests. It hides no deficiencies under a vague symbol or designation that may have as many interpretations as there are consumers to interpret it. It places on the canner responsibility for proper labeling and makes unnecessary the addition of more government agents to an already vastly expanded government service.

QUESTION OF BROKERAGE PAYMENTS TO COOPERATIVES

The National Industrial Recovery Board on October 12 issued an order for the purpose of clarifying the provisions of Executive Order No. 6606-A, dated February 17, 1934, which protected the right of cooperatives to buy under codes and to receive quantity discounts. Under the order approved October 12, no code provision may be interpreted to prohibit payment of a brokerage commission to a bona fide cooperative for services for which brokerage may properly be paid to any organization or person. The text of the order reads:

"Pursuant to Executive Order No. 6606-A, dated February 17, 1934, no provision of any code of fair competition heretofore or hereafter approved under said title of said Act shall be so construed or applied as to make it a violation of any such code for any member of any industry to pay or allow a brokerage commission to any bona fide and legitimate cooperative organization performing services or engaged in functions for which other persons may properly be paid such a commission. In determining whether a cooperative organization is performing such services and functions, no cognizance shall be taken of the fact that the said cooperative organization will distribute its actual earnings, whether acquired in the form of brokerage commissions or otherwise, to its members in the form of patronage dividends, notwithstanding also the fact that the members who in due course may receive a part of said brokerage commission as a patronage dividend may be the purchasers of the product or service in connection with which the said commission was realized."

Following issuance of the above order, questions were raised as to its interpretation in connection with the brokerage provisions of the various food codes. These questions were the subject of a meeting of the National Industrial Recovery Board on Wednesday, at which Division Administrator Riley protested the October 12 order in so far as it would defeat the policy of Division 6 of the NRA that brokerage should not be paid the buyer. The National Industrial Recovery Board is expected to issue a further statement or order which will serve to clarify the order of October 12.

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS IN FREIGHT RATE CASE

The Interstate Commerce Commission has announced the places and dates for the further hearings in the case involving an increase in freight rates and charges (Ex Parte No. 115). The schedule is as follows: Denver, Colo., October 26; Salt Lake City, Utah, October 29; Portland, Oreg., November 2; Birmingham, Ala., November 7; Dallas, Texas, November 7; San Francisco, Calif., November 9; Chicago, Ill., November 16; Washington, D. C., November 26.

NOTICE GIVEN OF APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION

Formal notice was issued on October 17 by the National Recovery Administration that application had been made by the Columbus Foods Corporation, Lawrence, Kans., for exemption from the provisions of the Code for the Canning Industry which place Kansas (except Cowley and Montgomery Counties) in the Northern wage district. Facts, information, or suggestions concerning, or objections to, this application must be submitted to Assistant Deputy Administrator J. Lawrence Pond, National Recovery Administration, prior to October 31.

ALABAMA TO REVISE FOREIGN CORPORATION LAW

The Association has been advised that at the forthcoming session of the Legislature of Alabama the foreign corporation law of that state will be revised and that those engaged in drafting the proposed revision are desirous of obtaining the views of corporations now doing business in Alabama and therefore familiar with the present law or that may later expect to engage in business there. It is stated that those in charge of the revision are particularly interested in learning the attitude of canners who do business in Alabama on the question of resale work or missionary selling. As this has been made local business by the U. S. Supreme Court in the Cheney Case, 267 U. S., and the Alabama Constitution, Section 232, requiring all foreign corporations doing any business in Alabama to have copies of their charter on file and an agent for service, it is desired to provide such easy and inexpensive conditions as will increase the resale work, because this has a beneficial effect in stimulating local business.

The present draft bill provides a charter fee of $25 and annual costs, presupposing ordinary capital employment in resale work, at something less than $15. A single form only will be filled in initially and annually as of March 15.

Canners who may be interested in the subject are invited to communicate with Mr. Daniel W. Troy, Suite 1003, Bell Building, Montgomery, Ala.

STATE CANNERS ASSOCIATION CONVENTIONS

Convention dates of state canners associations have been announced as follows:

Wisconsin Canners Association, November 12 and 13, Schroeder Hotel, Milwaukee.

Indiana Canners Association, November 22 and 23, Claypool Hotel, Indianapolis.

Ohio Canners Association, December 11 and 12, city and hotel to be decided.

Association of New York State Canners, Inc., December 13 and 14, Hotel Seneca, Rochester, N. Y.

Northwest Canners Association, January 3, 4, and 5, Portland, Oreg. (dates are tentative).

HAWAIIAN CANNING CODE HEARING TO BE RECONVENED OCT. 30

Public hearing to determine whether the minimum wages prescribed for the Territory of Hawaii in the canning and can manufacturing codes are adequate has been postponed until October 30 at the request of the Canning Industry Code Authority. The hearing was opened September 12 and adjourned to October 15. It will be reconvened in Honolulu on October 30.

CENSUS REPORT ON 1933 CANNED FOOD PRODUCTION

Preliminary statistics on the production of canned and processed fruits and vegetables in 1933 have been issued by the Census Bureau. These figures, which are subject to revision, show that the output of canned vegetables and soups in 1933 was 98,545,290 cases, valued at $183,620,681; canned fruits, 33,024,519 cases, $81,070,629; dried fruits, 998,947,462 pounds, $47,242,058; preserves, jams, jellies, and fruit butters, $19,276,642; salad dressings, $22,770,064; pickles, $20,809,913.

This industry, as defined for census purposes, embraces establishments engaged wholly or principally in canning, drying, and otherwise preserving fruits and vegetables, and in manufacturing preserves, jellies, pickles, sauces, dressings, ketchup, prepared mustard, etc. The census figures do not include data for the production of dried fruits on small farms and ranches but do include data for dried fruits produced on large fruit farms.

The following table summarizes the statistics, for the industry as above defined, on number of establishments, wage earners, etc., in 1933 as compared with 1931 and 1929:

	1933	1931	1929
Number of establishments	2,069	2,535	2,997
Wage earners (average for the year) a	88,883	80,184	98,866
Wages	$45,199,066	$54,001,402	$74,978,590
Cost of materials, containers, fuel, and purchased electric energy	268,077,385	322,004,905	462,062,128
Products, total value	438,820,931	513,001,043	750,342,041
Canned and processed fruits and vegetables	410,404,397	471,622,981	704,665,763
Other products, not normally belonging to the industry	28,416,534	41,378,062	45,676,278
Value added by manufacture b	170,743,546	190,996,138	288,279,913

a Not including salaried officers and employes. The item for wage earners is an average of the numbers reported for the several months of the year. In calculating it, equal weight must be given to full-time and part-time wage earners (not reported separately by the manufacturers), and for this reason it exceeds the number that would have been required to perform the work done in the industry if all wage earners had been continuously employed throughout the year. The quotient obtained by dividing the amount of wages by the average number of wage earners can not, therefore, be accepted as representing the average wage received by full-time wage earners. In making comparisons between the figures for 1933 and those for earlier years, the possibility that the proportion of part-time employment varied from year to year should be taken into account.

b Value of products less cost of materials, containers, fuel and purchased electric energy.

In presenting its statistics on the pack of individual products the Census Bureau states that in order to facilitate the preparation of returns by the smaller establishments for 1933, an abbreviated schedule was used for canvassing such establishments in many industries, including the canning industry. This schedule called merely for data on employes and their compensation, cost of materials, fuel, etc., and total value of products. As it did not provide for any detailed data on kinds and quantities of products, it has been necessary to include the total value of products ($11,286,027) reported on this schedule in a "Not reported in detail" item of $14,568,472. The total reported on the abbreviated schedule amounts to only 2.6 per cent of the total value of all products of the industry, but for certain individual products the corresponding percentages are somewhat larger. For this reason the detailed 1933 figures given in the following table are not strictly comparable with those for 1931.

The output of the canned vegetables and soups for which separate figures were obtained totaled 98,545,290 cases valued at $183,620,681 in 1933 as compared with 104,911,330 cases valued at $211,296,526 in 1931. The pack of canned fruits for which separate figures were obtained was 33,024,519 cases valued at $81,070,629 in 1933 as compared with 28,508,681 cases valued at $79,373,736 in 1931. The statistics for individual products follow:

VEGETABLES AND SOUPS

	1933	1931
Asparagus:		
Cases	2,055,665	1,878,006
Value	$7,209,960	$10,392,195
Beans, with pork, with sauce, and baked:		
Cases	16,403,240	11,730,701
Value	$24,392,648	$23,309,674
Beans, other than baked:		
Cases	8,809,668	12,420,714
Value	$14,281,005	$22,277,766
Beets:		
Cases	1,182,127	1,465,091
Value	$1,862,337	$2,374,109
Carrots:		
Cases	545,142	239,930
Value	$736,781	$340,944
Corn:		
Cases	9,786,273	19,376,512
Value	$17,073,172	$31,492,289
Greens, other than spinach:		
Cases	100,814	76,871
Value	$147,620	$138,745
Hominy:		
Cases	1,170,223	1,075,231
Value	$1,437,921	$1,350,300
Kraut:		
Cases	3,329,766	3,645,256
Value	$5,182,541	$5,428,614
Peas:		
Cases	13,089,326	13,253,040
Value	$28,173,310	$28,938,835
Pimientos:		
Cases	269,649	274,409
Value	$800,078	$980,610
Pumpkin and squash:		
Cases	1,735,921	1,007,503
Value	$2,601,497	$1,506,011
Rhubarb:		
Cases	26,140	45,975
Value	$42,743	$83,610
Spaghetti:		
Cases	3,167,722	2,796,835
Value	$5,612,105	$6,430,020

VEGETABLES AND SOUPS—*Continued*

Spinach:		
Cases	2,534,386	1,773,966
Value	$4,915,534	$3,863,294
Succotash:		
Cases	87,215	269,431
Value	$172,135	$559,789
Sweet potatoes:		
Cases	157,421	296,586
Value	$283,724	$583,371
Tomatoes:		
Cases	12,939,548	13,893,596
Value	$22,184,560	$21,694,102
Tomato juice:		
Cases	3,873,232	3,476,244
Value	$6,663,912	$6,211,595
Tomato sauce:		
Cases	1,817,928	465,510
Value	$3,149,387	$1,115,338
Vegetables, mixed:		
Cases	579,123	463,529
Value	$805,857	$1,088,694
Other canned vegetables:		
Cases	4,310,109	
Value	$8,921,584	14,986,304
Canned soups:		$41,136,615
Cases	10,574,652	
Value	$26,970,270	

FRUITS

	1933	1931
Apples:		
Cases	2,348,744	2,066,956
Value	$3,832,459	$3,321,767
Apricots:		
Cases	2,483,149	2,115,847
Value	$6,023,545	$5,500,714
Blackberries:		
Cases	380,949	748,430
Value	$701,133	$1,430,847
Blueberries:		
Cases	238,622	294,879
Value	$657,755	$698,245
Loganberries:		
Cases	169,531	444,420
Value	$414,604	$1,436,134
Raspberries:		
Cases	475,635	777,132
Value	$1,328,520	$2,702,162
Strawberries:		
Cases	99,984	285,570
Value	$349,956	$1,491,088
Cherries:		
Cases	2,501,144	1,904,422
Value	$6,323,516	$5,555,687
Fruit for salad:		
Cases	2,241,611	1,572,584
Value	$9,188,206	$6,936,621
Grapefruit:		
Cases	2,254,313	1,598,609
Value	$4,841,776	$3,835,003
Olives, ripe:		
Cases	355,436	816,222
Value	$1,518,914	$4,265,240
Orange juice:		
Cases	96,076	99,209
Value	$324,875	$277,466
Peaches:		
Cases	10,474,263	8,616,647
Value	$24,472,380	$22,639,588

Fruits—*Continued*		
Pears:		
Cases	4,735,403	3,917,832
Value	$12,855,435	$12,123,971
Plums:		
Cases	183,073	193,727
Value	$407,856	$461,163
Prunes:		
Cases	803,019	799,559
Value	$1,502,769	$1,627,140
Other canned fruits:		
Cases	3,182,067	2,256,036
Value	$6,326,861	$5,070,810

In addition to canned vegetables, soups and fruits the Census Bureau reported production of 998,947,462 pounds of dried fruits valued at $47,242,058 in 1933 as compared with 1,084,386,083 pounds valued at $60,564,703 in 1931. Miscellaneous processed products reported by the Bureau included the following, values only being given:

	1933	1931
Dried and dehydrated vegetables	$301,366	$251,989
Horse-radish, prepared	460,809	1,272,583
Ketchup	12,758,091	15,805,214
Kraut, in bulk	2,178,952	2,064,421
Maraschino cherries	1,659,058	3,304,468
Pickles	20,800,913	28,923,262
Prepared mustard	5,535,161	6,966,853
Preserves, jams, jellies, and fruit butters	19,276,642	27,101,113
Salad dressings:		
Mayonnaise	18,487,044	23,044,610
Thousand Island, French, Russian, and other dressings	4,283,020	6,791,697
Sauces	4,762,263	6,793,039
Not reported in detail a	14,568,472	7,477,624

a This item covers the output of establishments who did not report details on kinds and quantities of individual products.

Figures on the number of wage earners on the payrolls of establishments in the industry as defined by the Census Bureau are given for a representative week in the months of March, June, September and December. The figures, which follow, show the seasonal character of employment in the industry and permit comparison between 1933 and 1931.

	1933	1931
March	37,462	45,005
June	68,797	83,635
September	206,838	181,658
December	49,123	37,815

FROZEN AND PRESERVED FRUITS IN COLD STORAGE

The following table shows the holdings of fruit in cold storage reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics as of October 1, also a comparison with last year and with a five-year average:

	Oct. 1, 1934	Oct. 1, 1933	Five-year average
Apples:			
Barrels	205,000	276,000	460,000
Boxes	7,789,000	1,567,000	2,044,000
Baskets	3,260,000	2,851,000	2,200,000
Pears:			
Boxes	1,897,000	1,980,000	1,952,000
Baskets	226,000	249,000	393,000
Frozen and preserved fruits (pounds)	71,160,000	64,877,000	79,626,000

PUERTO RICAN GRAPEFRUIT CROP

About 260,000 boxes of grapefruit should mature in Puerto Rico between August 15 and December 31, 1934, and 625,000 boxes between January 1 and June 30, 1935, making a total of 1,085,000 boxes, according to the Supervising Inspector of the United States Department of Agriculture at San Juan.

FRUIT AND VEGETABLE MARKET COMPETITION

Carlot shipments as reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture

Commodity	Week ending Oct. 6	Week ending Oct. 13		Total for season through Oct. 13	
		1934	1933	1934	1933
Beans, snap and lima	43	80	21	12,581	10,105
Tomatoes	501	439	534	22,904	20,574
Green peas	124	93	117	6,264	8,053
All other vegetables—					
Domestic:					
Competing directly	4,081	3,990	3,357	159,539	141,398
Competing indirectly	24	42	49	421	379
Imports:					
Competing indirectly	23	37	27	215	194
Fruits:					
Citrus, domestic	1,628	1,556	1,654	127,183	128,453
imports	35	35	36	482	392
Others, domestic	3,959	3,484	3,225	45,832	34,851
imports	0	1	0	9	2
Index of fresh vegetable prices	73	73	84	.....	.....
Index of canned vegetable prices	88	88	70	.....	.....

PROGRESS OF SHRIMP PACK

	1934		1933	
	Oct. 4-Oct. 10	Aug. 2-Oct. 10	Oct. 5-Oct. 11	Aug. 3-Oct. 11
	Cases	*Cases*	*Cases*	*Cases*
East Coast	4,500	44,823	5,536	66,979
Alabama and Louisiana	20,312	314,238	18,139	293,008
Mississippi	1,500	57,751	600	77,329
Texas	9,923	26,604	2,000	26,300
Total	36,235	443,416	26,275	463,616

DEPARTMENT STORE SALES IN SEPTEMBER

Preliminary figures on the value of department store sales show a decrease from August to September of somewhat more than the estimated seasonal amount. The Federal Reserve Board's index, which makes allowance for differences in the number of business days and for usual seasonal changes, was 76 in September, on the basis of the 1923-1925 average as 100, compared with 79 in August and 72 in July. In comparison with a year ago, the value of sales for September was 4 per cent larger; when allowance is made for the fact that there was one less trading day this year than last, the increase from last year is about 9 per cent.

LAST PURCHASES OF DROUGHT CATTLE ORDERED

New authorizations to purchase approximately 646,700 head of cattle in drought states, issued by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, will bring the cattle buying program to a close. The estimated number of cattle that may be acquired under the new allocations, which are in addition to those cattle purchased under authorizations expiring on or before October 13, by states, are as follows: Colorado, 60,000; Kansas, 60,000; Missouri, 85,000; Nebraska, 60,000; Nevada, 5,000; New Mexico, 115,000; Oklahoma, 60,000; South Dakota, 26,700; Texas, 125,000; Utah, 10,000; and Wyoming, 40,000. The additional authorizations will bring the total number of cattle acquired in operations to remove livestock from feed deficit areas to approximately 7,737,000 head, and will bring expenditures for purchase and benefit payments in connection with the entire cattle-buying program to approximately $103,000,000.

Since September 28, when quotas expiring October 13 were issued, directors in charge of cattle purchases in states have been limiting buying operations to the most distressed areas, and county directors have been authorized to buy stock only from producers definitely unable to provide adequate feed for livestock. The cattle purchases are being financed by allocations from the Jones-Connally Act funds, and the Emergency Appropriations Act.

Purchase of sheep and goats in the drought area is being carried on under a fund of $10,000,000 made available from emergency appropriations. To date of October 6, a total of 1,910,513 head of ewes had been purchased, for which payment is being made at the rate of $2 per head. All cattle and sheep acquired, and suitable for processing, are being converted into food for relief distribution.

CONTENTS

	Page
Wholesale grocers ask opportunity to present labeling views to President	4217
B. F. Julian named member of Code Authority	4217
What's behind the report of the Consumers' Advisory Board on labeling	4217
Question of brokerage payments to cooperatives	4221
Schedule of hearings in freight rate case	4221
Notice given of application for exemption	4222
Alabama to revise foreign corporation law	4222
State canners' association conventions	4222
Hawaiian canning code hearing to be reconvened Oct. 30	4223
Census report on 1933 canned food production	4223
Frozen and preserved fruits in cold storage	4226
Puerto Rican grapefruit crop	4227
Fruit and vegetable market competition	4227
Progress of shrimp pack	4227
Department store sales in September	4227
Last purchases of drought cattle ordered	4228